

Application No. : 10/680,932
Filed : October 7, 2003

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 7-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This contention is respectfully traversed, and applicant believes that the originally filed specification does in fact support this subject matter. However, in order to obviate this interpretation, the claims are amended to more clearly defined subject matter that is more clearly supported.

As explained in the background and summary section pages 1-2 of the original specification, moving stage lights are "electronically controllable to move between various positions and to provide special effects". It is well known in the art that these devices are electronically controllable in this way. However, in any case, pages 1-2 specifically state this.

In addition, figure 14 shows a number of lamps 1403, 1407, 1405, all of which are shown as being remotely controllable via a line (shown in that Figure) coming into those lamps. As explained on page 19 lines 15-17 of the originally filed specification, this orientation "allows all lamps to have the same range of

Application No. : 10/680,932
Filed : October 7, 2003

controlled movement... during operation". This is also described other places within this specification, for example page 19 lines 3-5 describes that the lamps can be as set in an initial orientation and "thereafter controlling all lamps in a group as though they were the same".

Is well known in the field of stage lighting and especially as described above to control lamps in this way. In any case, the specification clearly describes controlling the lamp in this way. While admittedly the "controller" was not described in the original specification, the control was certainly described, and any device which can carry out control is a "controller".

In retrospect, applicant agrees that the specification did not specifically define a computer-based controller, although applicant believes that this would have been known to one having ordinary skill in the art. However, in order to obviate all of these problems, claims seven and 10 have been amended to recite receiving the control signal, rather than reciting the controller itself. This is clearly supported by the original specification as described above, since the specification described electronically controlling movement of these lights.

It is respectfully suggested that this obviates the rejection.

Application No. : 10/680,932
Filed : October 7, 2003

Claims 7-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

This rejection has been obviated by the amendment of the claims to define receiving the control signal rather than the controller itself.

This should obviate all remaining issues in the case, and a notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail (using the email address harris@schiplaw.com). I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response, (excluding those concurrently paid via EFS), to Deposit Account No. 50-4376.

Respectfully submitted,

Application No. : 10/680,932
Filed : October 7, 2003

Date: 10/4/2010 /Scott C Harris/
Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 74162
Scott C. Harris, Esq.
Law Office of Scott C. Harris, Inc.


P.O. Box 1389
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

P 858 756 7778
F 858 756 7717
M 619 823 7778

E harris@schiplaw.com
www.schiplaw.com